REMARKS

Claims 11-29 are pending prior to amendment herein. The drawings are objected to for not having textual labels. Claims 11-25, and 27-29 are provisionally rejected on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 11-23, and 27-30 of co-pending application US 10510221. Claims 11-26, 28, and 29 are provisionally rejected on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 10-22, and 25-29 of co-pending application US 10510312. Claims 11-28 are rejected under 35 USC 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter for not including any hardware components. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 USC 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter because the software is not recited on a computer-readable medium. Claims 11-22, 24, 25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuchlin et al. ("HIGHROBOT: Telerobotics in the Internet", Copyright 1997). Claim 23 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuchlin in view of Modeste et al. (US pub. 2003/0056012 A1).

Claims 11-29 are canceled herein. Claims 30-34 are new. Claim 30 is supported by the abstract, paragraph 19, FIG 3, and throughout. Claims 31-33 are supported by paragraph 9. Claim 34 is supported by paragraph 19, lines 11-21, and FIG 3. Paragraph numbers herein refer to the substitute specification.

RESPONSE TO DRAWING OBJECTIONS

Examiner objected to FIGs 1-5 for not having textual labels. There are only 3 drawing figures in the application. Replacement sheets for FIGS 1-3 figures with textual labels are provided with this response.

RESPONSE TO DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTIONS

The new claims have been submitted to clarify the invention over the prior art and over the cited co-pending applications 10510221 and 10510312.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 101

The new claims have been submitted to include hardware components, and the software is recited as being operatively installed on a web server computer.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 102

Kuchlin starts with an industrial controller, and modifies it to support web server functionality. Thus, his web server software is a modification of an industrial controller. This is opposite of the present invention, in which an industrial controller is an expansion module in a web server. Furthermore Kuchlin teaches in detail how to customize the industrial controller to support a web server with industrial automation functions by using object-oriented programming to create body objects in the web server software and corresponding proxy objects in the network client software (Kuchlin section 4.2 - 4.2.4).

Such customization is unlike the present invention, which adds an industrial automation expansion software module to a web server using a common interface protocol, and wherein the interface protocol is standard for a plurality of interface-compatible software expansion modules, such that the software expansion modules are integrated with, and part of, the web server software system. This combination is recited in present claim 30. More particularly, Kuchlin does not teach using an Internet protocol to provide communication not only with a network client, but between the expansion modules as well, and wherein communication between a web server kernel and the expansion modules is standardized on the Internet protocol. This combination is recited in present claim 31. Furthermore, Kuchlin does not teach a web server in which an industrial automation expansion module is one in a plurality of interface-compatible software expansion modules comprising a web page server (55), an XML parser (56), an industrial field bus access (57), a JAVA processor (59), a webcam processor (60), and an XML processor (64). This combination is recited in present claim 34.

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

A firewall is no longer recited in the claims. In any case, adding a firewall to Kuchlin does not correct the above deficiencies of Kuchlin in meeting the present invention.

Conclusion

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, a reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (MPEP 706.02(a) IV). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as recited in the claim, and the elements must be arranged as required by the claim (MPEP §2131). These criteria are not met by Kuchlin, as argued above. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the 35 USC 102 rejections. The 35 USC 103 rejection no longer applies, as noted above. The 35 USC 101 rejections, provisional double patenting rejections, and drawing objections have been addressed in this response. Therefore Applicants feel this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d), or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/21/07

By: _____

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830